Exhibit E



Deposition of: **Thomas Kinney , M.D.**

June 17, 2017

In the Matter of:

In Re: Bard IVC Filters Products Liability

Veritext Legal Solutions

1075 Peachtree St. NE , Suite 3625 Atlanta, GA, 30309 800.808.4958 | calendar-atl@veritext.com | 770.343.9696

	Page 21
1	BY MR. BROWN:
2	Q. And will you please ballpark the number of Bard
3	documents that were in that Dropbox.
4	A. I'm going to guess 20.
5	Q. Okay. Was the material that was provided to you
6	in the Dropbox folder the material that you reviewed and
7	relied upon in providing the opinions that are contained
8	in your expert report in this litigation?
9	A. It was back-up material. The main source for my
LO	document was the Kessler report.
L1	Q. So the material that was provided to you on the
L 2	Dropbox, you're saying, was just some back-up information;
L 3	but the primary source of what you relied upon in
L 4	authoring your report was the Kessler report?
L 5	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
L 6	BY MR. BROWN:
L 7	Q. Is that right?
L 8	A. Let me clarify a little bit more, or I guess
L9	embellish. So there For instance, there was a 510(k)
20	that I reviewed for the original Simon Nitinol filter.
21	There was deposition from Dr. Asch that was in there,
22	as I recall.
23	Q. Okay. And those were part of the Dropbox
24	materials?
25	A. Correct.

	Page 24
1	A. It is.
2	Q. I will represent to you that this is the
3	curriculum vitae that was attached to your expert report
4	in this case. Okay?
5	A. Right.
6	Q. Is that curriculum vitae the most current
7	curriculum vitae that you have?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Doctor, I see here you received a master's
10	degree in mechanical engineering in 1979; is that right?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. As part of that master's degree in mechanical
13	engineering, and your previous degree, which was a
14	bachelors in physics, did you have any coursework that
15	involved inferior vena cava filters?
16	A. No.
17	Q. How about implantable medical devices generally?
18	A. No.
19	Q. You don't have a Ph.D. in biomechanical
20	engineering, do you?
21	A. No, I do not.
22	Q. Then you started medical school in 1983?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Did you work continuously as an engineer between
25	1979 when you received your masters in mechanical

Veritext Legal Solutions

Page 25 1 engineering and 1983 when you started medical school? 2 Yes, I did. I worked for NASA for a year and a 3 half doing aeronautical design and wind tunnel. 4 And then I worked for Thomas Fogarty as a bioengineer designing medical devices, prototyping medical devices, 5 6 and doing FDA submissions for four years. 7 Why don't we start with the job you took 8 immediately after receiving your master's degree in 9 mechanical engineering. Was that the job with NASA? That was the job with Thomas Fogarty. 10 Α. 11 And what specifically did you do for Ο. 12 Dr. Fogarty? We were designing angioplasty balloons. We did 13 Α. 14 pathophysiology experiments with mechanism of angioplasty. 15 We designed vascular clamps. He was a referral person for many other physicians 16 17 that were interested in innovation and design, so we did some ureteral dilators for one of his urology colleagues. 18 I designed a vascular clamp for one of Dr. Fogarty's 19 20 former partners, Dr. Pat Daily, who was here at San Diego. We also got involved in designing a cardioplegia 21 jacket to do cardiac bypass. And that was a project I 22 23 continued when I went to medical here, and that project we actually did a 510(k) submission for FDA as well. 24 You mentioned a number of medical devices that 25 Q.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

internship.

Page 28 there, his report. I wouldn't have any other specific knowledge in, say, 2000 I was kind of doing other things. Okay. You mentioned that you continued your Q. work with the cardioplegia jacket when you began medical school in 1984; is that right? Α. 1983. Ο. '83. And, then, did you continue to work with the cardioplegia jacket through the time that you were in medical school? We did. So that -- that became -- I went to medical school here at UCSD, and we had an independent study project, and that was my study project for my graduation, and we actually did a human -- human trial actually. We evaluated that in humans actually. And that that passed to another engineer as I kind of moved onto my

- Q. What was your role in the study regarding the cardioplegia jackets used in humans?
- A. Well, we -- we made -- we made the jacket, and we -- we actually were measuring -- we made these -- they are mister probes to measure the temperatures to see if it was effective in terms of achieving the temperatures that they felt were protective during the periods where the heart was stopped to do these prolonged procedures for --

Veritext Legal Solutions

Page 31

that are elicited by a balloon in a different size stenoses, and that got published in Academic Radiology. The reason I'm kind of laughing is my other authors on there told me they didn't understand a word I was saying in there, but -- but that was engineering. Yeah, it was a mechanical analysis.

- Q. So you performed like a mathematical mechanical analysis?
 - A. Right.

- Q. Right?
- A. Yes. Yeah.
- Q. But as far as actually designing medical device-type work, like you would do as a mechanical engineer, did you stop doing that after medical school?
- A. I didn't design anything. But, you know, I -Matthew, I did get involved with a patent lawsuit with
 Bard actually with their Mahurkar catheter, and there was
 a lot of engineering analysis about the theories of how to
 get better flow from those with different sort of channels
 and things like that. So there was some mechanical
 aspects of that. But actually, design -- it was kind of
 evaluating design, if you will, Matthew, but it wasn't -we weren't building stuff or changing stuff, but it was
 kind of looking at the evaluation of the novelty of the
 ideas, those sort of issues.

	Page 32
1	Q. Okay. And what product did that relate to
2	again?
3	A. It was a Mahurkar hemodialysis catheter.
4	Q. Can you describe for us what that is?
5	A. It's a catheter that is implanted in a jugular
6	vein, goes to just above the heart. It stays in the
7	patient for extended periods of time. It has two access
8	ports, one blood goes in and one blood comes out, and it
9	gets hooked to a dialysis machine.
10	Q. Since graduating from medical school in 1987,
11	you have been a full-time practicing physician?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Would it be fair to say that you focused the
14	last 30 years of your professional career to treating
15	patients?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. You don't hold yourself out as an expert in
18	designing IVC filters, do you?
19	A. Well, I have an interest in IVC filters, and I
20	published quite a bunch of articles. So there's an
21	element of there's a knowledge of expertise, and then
22	there is an engineering background. So while I don't
23	design I haven't designed IVC filters. I can look at a
24	design and evaluate its features or the plusses and
25	possibly the minuses of the features of that device based

	Page 35
1	A. Help me, Matthew. What does that mean,
2	"demonstrative"?
3	Q. The physicians come in, and you are showing them
4	how these devices look in a bench top setting.
5	A. Correct.
6	Q. But as far as actually designing bench top
7	testing that is going to be submitted to the FDA, for
8	example?
9	A. No, we did not do that. That's correct.
10	Q. Would you agree that you're not an expert in the
11	field of marketing?
12	A. No, I'm not a marketer. No.
13	Q. Do you have any education, training, or
14	experience in marketing?
15	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
16	BY MR. BROWN:
17	Q. You can answer.
18	A. I have no experience in marketing. Other than
19	marketing myself as a physician, I guess. That's We
20	all kind of market ourselves, you know, on a level.
21	You We deal with people. We're Physicianship is
22	kind of one on one, so there's a I don't know. It's
23	not commercial marketing, I guess, is what you're saying,
24	Matthew. Sorry.
25	Q. Do you hold yourself out as an expert in the

Veritext Legal Solutions 770.343.9696

	Page 67
1	plaintiffs?
2	A. These two fine gentlemen mostly.
3	MR. LOPEZ: He just looked at you, Joe, when he
4	said that.
5	MR. JOHNSON: I agree with him.
6	THE WITNESS: He was the closest to me.
7	Actually, I got involved because Wendy was so nice.
8	BY MR. BROWN:
9	Q. In your report that we have marked as Exhibit 4
10	to today's deposition, do you agree that you're helping to
11	support the plaintiffs' arguments in this lawsuit?
12	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
13	THE WITNESS: I would say yes.
14	BY MR. BROWN:
15	Q. In your report, do you agree that you are making
16	an argument for the plaintiffs' position in this lawsuit?
17	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
18	THE WITNESS: I guess maybe I should ask you to
19	be more specific, I guess.
20	BY MR. BROWN:
21	Q. Well, the report that we have marked as
22	Exhibit 4 is several hundred pages long, and it lays out
23	opinions that you subscribe to at the end related to
24	Bard's IVC filters; is that right?
25	A. Correct. Correct.

Veritext Legal Solutions 770.343.9696

	Page 68
1	Q. And the upshot of the report is that in the
2	opinion of the authors, Bard filters are defective.
3	You understand that?
4	A. Yes.
5	MR. LOPEZ: Object to form.
6	BY MR. BROWN:
7	Q. So in this report, do you agree that you're
8	making an argument for the plaintiffs' position in this
9	lawsuit?
10	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	BY MR. BROWN:
13	Q. I want to turn to Paragraph 14 of the report.
14	A. (Indicating.)
15	Q. Paragraph 14 says, "We apply the same analyses
16	and methodology in reaching these kind of opinions as we
17	apply in our professional, clinical and teaching
18	capacities and in many respects in our research, writing,
19	and submitting medical articles to peer-reviewed journals
20	and publications."
21	Do you see that?
22	A. I do.
23	Q. Can you describe what you mean by that?
24	A. Well, I do peer-reviewed articles as a reviewer,
25	and so I have to analyze and look at the methodology of

Veritext Legal Solutions

	Page 73
1	Q. Would you agree that if you did ignore data that
2	weighs against the opinion that Bard's filters are
3	defective, that you would be applying the same level of
4	intellectual rigor in this case as you apply in your
5	private practice as a researcher and clinician?
6	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
7	THE WITNESS: I would say that I'm always
8	willing to look at data. If you have some data to show
9	me, I'd be happy to look at it and opine about it.
10	BY MR. BROWN:
11	Q. In drafting this report, did you take data and
12	information out of context?
13	A. I don't think so.
14	Q. If you did take data and information out of
15	context, would you agree that you wouldn't be applying the
16	same level of intellectual rigor to your work in this case
17	as you apply in your work as a clinician?
18	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
19	THE WITNESS: Again, I would say show me what
20	you don't agree with, and we'll look at it and make an
21	intelligent decision.
22	BY MR. BROWN:
23	Q. Okay. How was the report, which we marked as
24	Exhibit 4, prepared?
25	A. We basically used the document by Dr. Kessler is

Veritext Legal Solutions 770.343.9696

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 74 what we did, and we were -- we were asked -- we were tasked, actually, as interventional radiologists who were academicians and involved with some of the writing standards about IVC filters, and we were tasked to assess the information that was provided by Bard about their filters, and whether we thought that there was transparency in that in our approach to, say, getting consent for patients. We were -- I lost my train of thought. Sorry. MR. LOPEZ: If you need to refer to your report, you can, by the way. THE WITNESS: Yeah. You know, as clinicians that have multiple years of experience on IVC filters, we were, you know, able to make opinions about, you know, what we thought was done. were able to assess the data that he presented, some of the experimental data, that included lab experiments and animal experiments. Basically, it was listed as a permanent filter that

Basically, it was listed as a permanent filter that had -- that was supposed to act like permanent filters that we had before.

My career and Anne Roberts' career spans the transition in filters from permanent devices to retrieval filters. And we were promised that the retrieval filters would have the same sort of performance characteristics

Veritext Legal Solutions 770,343,9696

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 75

that our permanent devices had. And unfortunately, as the experience -- as the clinical experience accrued with the retrieval filters, we were finding that that assumption was not true, and there was -- it turned out, you know, I had done a plenary session right before Bard did your major marketing release of the Recovery Nitinol filter. The -- The SIR meeting in 2004 was in Phoenix, and we were -- my plenary session was on venous thromboembolism. And we were all excited about having the use of retrieval Because we all remembered that ten-year-old kid filters. that had a trauma that we put a filter in, and he had that filter for multiple decades, and we never felt real comfortable talking to that patient or his mother or father about what was going to happen with this multiple decades. Really, you kind of say, "We don't really know," and that's an answer that families like to hear because they -- they assume you are the doctor, you know everything and, you know, you should know these things.

So again, I lost my train of thought. Sorry BY MR. BROWN:

Q. All right. Well, I'm interested right now in how the report actually was physically prepared. Because we have three authors and several hundred pages of material here, and I want to get a sense as to how putting pen to paper or fingers to the typewriter this was

Veritext Legal Solutions

Page 76

actually done.

- A. Okay.
- Q. So can you elaborate on how Exhibit 4 was prepared?
- A. I -- My section, I wrote looking at the Kessler report, and I did a literature search on -- on the -- on the retrieval -- all the Bard filters, basically, from the initial animal studies. I even looked back at the Simon Nitinol data. I had experience putting in Simon Nitinol filters myself.

And so we looked at the preliminary data before some of the animal -- I looked at some animal abstracts that Dr. Kaufman wrote back when he was still at Boston, and even before that, it was approved as a device for humans.

Then I looked at Dr. Asch's studies. And that study was clearly done as a -- as just a retrievable study, and it was a short-term study, but there were -- again, you know, we talked about signals before. There were things in that study that we were concerned about in terms of there were some fractures, and there was a surprise migration of a filter that they fortunately caught because they had scheduled to retrieve it at that time.

And then there was a subsequent report that demonstrated yet another issue with a filter that came out a few years later.

Veritext Legal Solutions

Page 77

Then I looked at the 510(k), and I looked at the studies that were involved in the 510(k).

What else did I look at? Then I looked at all the documents that were listed by Dr. Kessler in terms of when they did the market release which was, I recall, was in January of 2004. And then the rapidity with what sort of issues came up.

And the thing that surprised all of us that had experience with the permanent filters was we were seeing complications that we had never seen before. I do remember my point about the plenary session. What I said in that plenary session was that there were design changes made in the retrieval filter to make it retrievable; and again, we assumed that those design changes were made in a compatible fashion that the performance characteristics would be similar as a permanent filter. But I remember in that plenary session saying that it's possible that the features that make a filter retrievable may also make it migrate easily or move, and those are design tradeoffs. You know, this is the engineering aspect again, and we'll see if that's what happens or not.

And so anyway, I am getting off the track a little bit, Matthew, and I apologize. But basically, I went through the Kessler report, and went through sequentially all the different aspects of that.

Veritext Legal Solutions

		Page 81
1	Α.	This was three to four weeks.
2	Q.	At the very back of the report there is an
3	Appendix A	١.
4	Α.	(Indicating.)
5	Yes.	
6	Q.	It's titled, "Facts and Data Considered."
7	Do yo	ou see that?
8	Α.	I do.
9	Q.	Were you given the literature listed here?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	There are a number of expert reports that are
12	listed. W	Were you given those expert reports as well?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	Did you read the full reports?
15	Α.	I did.
16	Q.	Of all of the expert reports that are listed
17	here?	
18	Α.	I did.
19	Q.	Then you were given internal Bard documents that
20	are listed	l here?
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	Did you read the full documents?
23	A.	Not Well, not Maybe not all of them. But
24	if, for in	stance, sometimes on the reproduced copies I had
25	of of K	Ressler's, I couldn't necessarily read some of

Veritext Legal Solutions

	Page 82
1	the graphs, I would look then to make sure I was reading
2	those correctly. But this report was I felt so
3	comfortable with what he wrote, that I didn't read all of
4	those, no.
5	Q. You felt so comfortable with the report that
6	Dr. Kessler wrote?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. The material that is listed in Appendix A, Facts
9	and Data Considered, this is the material that you believe
10	was on the Dropbox?
11	(Interruption in proceedings.)
12	MR. LOPEZ: Maybe it's a little more annoying
13	than I thought.
14	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Matthew.
15	BY MR. BROWN:
16	Q. Let me ask the question again.
17	The material that's listed in Appendix A, which is
18	titled, "Facts and Data Considered," is that the material
19	that you believe was provided to you via Dropbox?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. How did you pick these documents from among all
22	the documents that were produced in the litigation or were
23	they just provided to you?
24	A. No. They were from the report, so I would find
25	a section that Kessler had written, and it would have,

Veritext Legal Solutions 770.343.9696

	Page 83
1	say, a table or some specific quoted number that was
2	important to me in my argument, and I would say, "Well,
3	this refers to this document."
4	And so it was much like I wrote a medical article
5	when I'm quoting what the article says. You give it a
6	reference, and that's that's the way I used these.
7	Q. So am I correct that these are all documents
8	that you requested specifically?
9	A. I didn't specifically request them, but they
L O	were in this in Kessler's report.
11	Q. Were some of the documents that are listed in
12	Appendix A, documents that you did not specifically
13	request?
L 4	A. It's possible. I suppose, I mean
15	Q. Are you aware that over 1.5 million documents
16	have been produced in this litigation?
L 7	A. I'm not surprised.
18	Q. Is that the first time you've heard that figure?
19	A. I don't think it is, actually. I think I've
20	heard there's a large number.
21	Q. And there are 42 documents that are listed in
22	Appendix A?
23	A. Correct.
24	Q. So that's less than 0.0028 percent?
25	MR. JOHNSON: Form.

	Page 84
1	BY MR. BROWN:
2	Q. Agreed?
3	A. Yeah. Yeah.
4	Q. During the course of your practice, has any
5	medical device company, other than medical device
6	companies who you may have had a formal consulting
7	agreement with, ever showed you their internal documents?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Would you agree that the information in the
LO	internal documents might be unreliable?
11	MR. LOPEZ: Form.
12	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. Can you be more
13	specific? I'm not sure what you mean.
L 4	BY MR. BROWN:
15	Q. Sure.
16	In a general sense, would you agree that information
L 7	contained in internal company documents could be
18	unreliable?
19	MR. JOHNSON: Form.
20	THE WITNESS: That is a possibility. I mean,
21	anything could be unreliable.
22	BY MR. BROWN:
23	Q. Would you agree that data that's included in
24	internal company documents could be preliminary?
25	MR. JOHNSON: Form.

Veritext Legal Solutions

	Page 96
1	A. Probably about Probably in the last, say, a
2	week ago.
3	Q. So about June 10th, 2017?
4	A. Right.
5	Q. Did you do any searching of materials that were
6	contained in that database?
7	A. I did, yeah.
8	Q. What did you search?
9	A. You know, like I said, if I had trouble reading
10	one of Kessler's things, and I was looking for something
11	to grasp or hard to read, I wanted to look and see, so I
12	would pull that document up.
13	Q. Okay. Other than pulling up individual
L 4	documents from Dr. Kessler's report that you wanted to
15	review, did you do any other searching of the material in
16	that database?
L 7	A. No. My My main focus was the Kessler report.
18	I guess in my report too.
19	Q. How did you access this database that you first
20	accessed about a week ago?
21	A. I'm not sure what you mean.
22	Q. Do you have Is it on the internet?
23	A. Yes. Yeah.
24	Q. Did you have to enter a user name and password
25	or something?

	Page 104
1	BY MR. BROWN:
2	Q. Dr. Kinney, I want to turn to the back part of
3	your report to the schedules.
4	A. Okay.
5	Q. There is a Schedule 1 that says, "SIR Quality
6	Improvement Guidelines: Analysis of filters studied,
7	outcome and conclusions reached in referenced to
8	articles."
9	MR. JOHNSON: What page is that on, Matt?
10	MR. BROWN: It's after page 115.
11	MR. JOHNSON: Okay. I got you.
12	BY MR. BROWN:
13	Q. Do you have Schedule 1 in front of you, Doctor?
14	A. I do.
15	Q. Did you write this?
16	A. I did not.
17	Q. Do you know who wrote it?
18	A. I do not.
19	Q. Does Schedule 1 have any bearing on your
20	opinions that you have provided in the first 115 pages of
21	the report?
22	A. No. But they use the same articles I I cite
23	but no, I didn't I didn't use this.
24	Q. Do you know if Dr. Roberts or Dr. Kalva wrote
25	Schedule 1?

	Page 105
1	A. I do not.
2	Q. Would you turn to Schedule 2, which is entitled,
3	"Bard Employees Testifying Regarding The Use Of SIR
4	Article Quality Improvement Guidelines."
5	Do you see that?
6	A. I do.
7	Q. Did you write this?
8	A. I did not.
9	Q. Do you know who wrote it?
10	A. I do not.
11	Q. Did you review Schedule 2 as part of drafting
12	the report?
13	A. I I recognize the comments on these because I
14	read the I read the depositions, but I did not use this
15	specific document.
16	Q. The next schedule is also entitled Schedule 2
17	and is entitled, "Bard Employees Testifying" Strike
18	that.
19	Sorry. It's a long schedule.
20	The next schedule is entitled Schedule 5, "Supporting
21	testimony from Bard employees on the importance of
22	providing pertinent information to physicians for making a
23	risk-benefit determination."
24	Do you see that?
25	A. I do.

Veritext Legal Solutions

	Page 106
1	Q. Did you write this?
2	A. No, I did not.
3	Q. Do you know who wrote Schedule 5?
4	A. I do not.
5	Q. Did you review or rely on Schedule 5 in forming
6	the opinions expressed in the first 115 pages of your
7	report?
8	A. I didn't Well, I didn't use this schedule,
9	but I I recognize some of the comments again.
10	Q. You recognize some of the testimony from
11	depositions that you've read?
12	A. Correct. That's correct.
13	Q. But as far as the actual Schedule 5, you didn't
14	review or refer to it in drafting your report?
15	A. Correct. That's correct. It's possible that
16	those were written by Dr. Roberts or Kalva, but I don't
17	I don't recall. You'll have to ask them.
18	Q. If you hop ahead to Schedule 5, there's a second
19	Schedule 5, just before Appendix A. It's entitled,
20	"Bard's internal documents demonstrating the improper use
21	of SIR Quality Improvement Guidelines."
22	A. (Indicating.)
23	Yes, I see.
24	Q. Do you see that?
25	A. I do.

	Page 107
1	Q. Did you write this Schedule 5?
2	A. I did not, but I kind of made my own, actually,
3	when I was reviewing the the document that from
4	Kessler.
5	Q. What do you mean that you kind of made your own?
6	A. I was trying to keep track of the timing of
7	things, so I wrote it on a piece of paper. I'm not sure I
8	even still have the paper, but I it's such a long
9	document, it's The timing of things is kind of
10	important, so I kind of did that on my own.
11	Q. When you say it's such a long document, you're
12	referring to Dr. Kessler's report?
13	A. Right.
14	Q. And so as you were going through Dr. Kessler's
15	report, you were making notes to yourself about the
16	chronology of events listed in Dr. Kessler's report?
17	A. That's right.
18	Q. As far as Schedule 5 that we're discussing here
19	as part of your report, you didn't review or rely on this
20	in forming your opinions specifically; correct?
21	A. I did not use this, no.
22	Q. And you didn't write this?
23	A. I didn't.
24	Q. Do you know who wrote it?
25	A. I do not.